G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—20 12 13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Letters Rotes
Aug 132-87(1-4)

1892-3
~~191~~.
(Madras)

File No. 172

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Unauthorized alienation of Arkan garden belonging to the Sri Appaswamiyaswami temple at Ballur, Chennapatna Taluk.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES. LATER REFERENCES

No. 347.

Memorandum

Nands. Comrs. Docket No. 79 dt. 15th May 76, submitting the Proceedings connected with certain irregularities in the case of a garden belonging to the Temple of Apprameya Swami at Malúr in the Closepett Taluk.—

In the year 1869 when some of the jewels belonging to the Temple of Apprameya Swami at Malúr were stolen, the Amildar, in reporting the same to the Dy. Comr., suggested that the value of the stolen property should be made good by the Temple Servants.—

Report No. 476 dt. 20th Sepr. 69

Order No. 386 dt. 30th Sepr. 69

2 The Dy. Comr. approved the Amildar's suggestion on the understanding that the loss of the property was doubtless to be attributed to want of care on the part of the Temple Servants,— and the Amildar was called on to recover from each of the Servants a quota of the value of the property lost.—

The

3.— The Servants of the Temple preferred an Appeal against the Dy. Commr.s order, whereon the Commr. of Nandy (Major Clarke) passed an order to the effect that " The order passed by the Dy. Commr. (dt. 30: Sept.r/69) was based on the report of the Amildar, who seemed to have suppressed all allusion to the Guarantee given by the Parpatyagar Krishnaiya & by Venkatanarsaiya (Shanbogue). By this Guarantee these persons expressly undertook to be personally & pecuniarily responsible for the articles belonging to the Temple in their keeping, & they must clearly be made to abide by the terms of that Guarantee.— In reversal therefore of the Dy. Suptt.s Order the Parpatyagar & Venkatanarasaiya will be held severally & jointly responsible for the necessary articles & the Amildar will be directed to proceed to recover the estimated value viz. Rs. 607-4-4 from them"

dt. 14-9-70.

4. The Amildar to whom this order was communicated thro' the Dy. Commr., fixed the quota payable by each of the two individuals, and attached such

property of each, both moveable and immoveable, as was thought sufficient to fetch the amount due by each man.— In the public auction that took place, the amount realized on the property of the Parpatyagar ~~xxx~~ was found sufficient to pay his quota, but the sale proceeds of the Shanbogue's property fell short by Rs: 2 67-15-11.

5. Further property of the Shanbogue was therefore looked for; and it being then brought to notice that the Shanbogue had a cocoa garden known as "Anekan Tota" in the village of Mainakanhalli in the same Taluk, the Amildar asked permission of the Dy. Commr to attach this garden on account of the balance due by the Shanbogue.

Urzi No. 491 dt. 6: October/71

St. 9: October/71

6. The permission asked for was granted by Mr. Krishna Mirle, ~~xxxxxxxx~~ the Asstt. Commr and the Amildar attached the garden.— Before effecting, however, the sale thereof, the Amildar suggested that permission might be obtained from the Commr of the Division for effecting

effecting the sale of this immoveable property. - But Mr. Ricketts, the then Dy. Comr., ordered the sale, considering the Comr's permission unnecessary on the ground that Dy Comrs had sufficient authority to order the sale of Ryots' holdings for the amounts due by the Ryots. - The Amildar effected the sale in favor of one Thamanja for Rs. 132. -

Order No. 389 dt. 20-11-71

× Auction List dt. 12 Feby/7

7. - A Petition was then received in the Chief Comr's office from one Dása Bóyi who complained that the above mentioned garden was the property of the Temple of Apprameyaswami and that the sale of the garden on account of the Thamboguè's liability was irregular &c. -

8. The Petition was, thro' the Comr., referred to the district authority, who called on the Amildar to submit a report on the subject. - The Amildar reported that as seen from the Pudivat Accounts of 1869, the Thamboguè's uncle Venkataramanaiya placed the garden under the supervision of two individuals, Venkatapataya & Venkatanaradaiya, in 1799, on Pudivat terms in favor of the Temple, whereby a sum of 5 pagodas per annum out of the Ryot's share of the benefit

Report No. 138 dt. 11-6-72

No sum on the purchase of the Giving-back was the value

benefit arising from the garden was to be paid towards the annual processions &c: in the Temple, — that in the year 1862/63 (when Dalaje gardens were converted into Nagadigal) the Chanbogue held the garden on Kandayam tenure as per the Revenue Accounts of that year, and that no further documents were found to show that the garden was the property of the Temple. —

9.— The Comr. then ordered the sale of the garden to be cancelled, the sale proceeds to be refunded to the purchaser, & the garden to be placed under the Government management. —

10. Accordingly the cancelment of the sale was announced to the public, and the sale proceeds refunded, but, while taking measures to bring the garden under the direct management of Govt. the Amildar met with an objection from the Chanbogue's brother Venkatapatayya who came forward to state that the garden in question was a joint

Pocket No. 851 dt. 2 Decr/72 is referred to in the Dy. Comr's Order No. 372 dt. 5 Decr/72.

X. Amildar's report No. 120 dt. 25 June/73.

... of the Sub-Collector ... parcel for sale by Romaldy & the Shanbogue; that the sale above mentioned affected only the Shanbogue's share, & that therefore Virasami Shetty should not be taken into the Government management.

11 The Shanbogue rejected the objection to the Dy Comr's order & was accordingly ordered to deliver the garden to Ferris & Co. under the Govt management as the objection raised by the Shanbogue's brother was inadmissable inasmuch the Shanbogue himself had no right over the garden. In execution of this order the garden was given to a certain individual on Ijara tenure of Rs 203 per annum.

Order No. 105 dt. 2nd July 73

Sanadi's report No. 287 dt. 29th Sept 73

12 There was again a complaint by Shanmugam (the purchaser mentioned in para 6 above) before the Comr to the effect that the garden in question had been mortgaged to him by the Shanbogue, that he had possession, enjoyment of and that therefore it should be restored to him. The Shanbogue likewise appealed to the Comr claiming the possession of the garden as his ancestral property.

Comr's Docket No. 114 dt. 29th August 73

Comr's Docket No. 119 dt. 4th Sept 73

13 The Dy Comr was called on to report on the subject. In the report accordingly made, the Dy Comr states that the Shanbogue has

Dy Comr's Docket No. 112 dt. 29th Nov 73

had held the garden on Gutta tenure, but as he concealed the tenure under which he held it the garden was taken away — from his possession as belonging to the Temple. —

Order under Docket No 268 dt. 15th Jany/74. —

14 Major Hill (the Comr) passed thereon an order as follows "On the cancelment of the sale it followed that the land should revert to the former holder (the Shanbogue) who held a Patta for it. — The ground given for disturbing his possession by the Dy. Comr — viz — that he concealed the tenure under which he held it, is not sufficient to justify his being deprived of his lien thereon. — It therefore should be restored to him, and the Dy. Comr can call on him to act upto his engagement. —

"No summary order can be passed on Shamaiya's — Petition beyond referring him to the constituted Courts for the recovery of his money." —

15 The Shanbogue was therefore put again in possession of the Garden; He

Major Hill was not justified in passing this order — which superseded the order passed by the permanent incumbent of this office, in which the garden was ordered to be transferred to the [illegible] by Govr [illegible]

I concur [illegible]

He then petitioned the Dy. Comr claiming the Izara amount which had till then been paid by the Izaradar of the garden, minus the cost of the processions in the Temple. —

Dy Comrs Proceedings dt. 19th Nov /75

16. — The Dy. Comr rejected this claim of the Shanbogue as inadmissible & observed in his proceedings that "The Petitioner (the Shanbogue) is not entitled to the amount, that he is still under suspension from his service as Shanbogue as he has not paid as per orders his share of the value of the stolen property belonging to the Temple, and that the garden was first put to auction on the understanding that it was the Petrs property in satisfaction of his liability but afterwards found that it was Pudiwal Garden of the Devasthan

17. — The above proceedings of the Dy. Comr having been submitted to the Comr for information, the latter made a brief report of the case to the Chief Comr, observing that some stringent rules were necessary regarding the safe custody of Temple property (which

* Letter No. 338 dt 8 Dec /75

(which point was settled and the necessary instructions issued in the Chief Comm^rs order No. 9695 / G. 216 dt. 16th March/76)

18.— With regard to Major Hill's order referred to in para 14 above, the Comm^r states that he does not concur in the arrangement ordered by Major Hill, as under the circumstances that Patta should have been made out in the name of the Dastan with Shanbogue as custodean - not in the name of the Shanbogue himself who now of course considers himself as the proprietor acknowledged by Government.—

Letter No. 338 dt. 8th Dec^r/75

19. As Major Hill was however exercising co-ordinate jurisdiction when he passed the order, Col: Pearse leaves it to the Chief Comm^r to affirm or modify it as the Chief Comm^r may think desirable.—

20. It seems to me that there was no necessity to set aside the sale of the land in question

21 It being admitted and generally known that the original owner of the land (Uncle of the present Shanbogue) intended that out of the annual income ~~of the land~~ thereof a sum of 5 Pagodas should be paid to the temple, the purchaser, whoever he may be, will be bound & may be legally required to continue the payment.

22.– The land itself was not made over to the Devasthanam, which had only a lien on it for the due payt. of the annual allowce.

23.– To simplify matters I beg to suggest that the purchaser be called upon to state whether he is willing to pay the 5 Pagodas annually & if he is, the sale may be confirmed and the property made over to

If the purchaser at the Govr. sale got it without these conditions, he could of course refuse to pay the allowce. to the Temple

Sales by [illegible] are [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] or [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] property –

I see no objection to this course – and as the purchaser was a mortgagee, he wd. perhaps be willing to accept the land on the terms

him after obtaining a document from him on proper stamp bond himself, his heirs & assigns to pay the allowance.

2dly If the sale is not to be confirmed then the only alternative left is to refund the purchase money to the purchaser, and to require the Shanbogue who is at present in possession to execute a muchulka to the same effect as above stated, reserving to Govt the power of selling the land to another if the annual allowance is not regularly made

R. T. Thumboo Chetty
29/7/76

The case proposed to be succeeded pass by is adopted. and order passed accordingly

Notice to be taken of the notice of claim order to be moved by the Asst Commr when the Rule of 15 Jan/76 respecting his Jurisdiction over 2 Dec 1872.

7/8/76

A. Sherwood
Asst Commr

1.8.76

Copied
3/8/76

25. The course proposed in para 23 above, was approved & the Commissioner was requested to ascertain & report whether Thamanya, the purchaser of the Garden in dispute, was willing to pay annually 5 Pagodas to the Temple of Appramiya Swamie & to execute a Muchalika accordingly, binding himself, his heirs & assigns to continue the allowance. —

26. In reply the Comr. states, as reported by the Dy. Comr. of Bangalore, that the said Thamanya is willing to pay annually 6 (not 5) Pagodas to the Temple and to execute a Muchalika to this effect, binding himself, his heirs and assigns to continue the payment. —

27. — Thamanya (Thamanna) has also presented a Petition to the Chief Comr., stating that he is willing to pay annually a sum of 6 Pagodas & 3 Fanams which is the sum fixed for the Temple processions &c, and that on the 18th. August last he agreed before the Amildar to execute a Muchalika to the same effect. — The purchase money of Rs. 132, has been refunded

Ch: Comr's Pro: 4704 / G. 111 dt. 7th August 1876. —

Letter No. 224 dt. 4th Sept. 1876

In the Amildar's Report, alluded to in para 4 of the Memo: the sum originally paid is stated to be 5 Pagodas, as observed by the Memo: appears to have subsequently been increased (not known how) to Rs. 18-5-3 or to 6 Pagodas & 3 Fanams. —

* No. 1589 dt. 20th Augt. 1876. —

refunded to him, which sum he will now reimburse to Government, and he prays that orders may issue to put him in possession of the garden and to make the Patta thereof in his name.

28. The Court may be asked to confirm the sale to Shamanah after requiring him to pay the purchase money and obtaining a Kuchilka on proper stamps to the Effect already suggested by me. The purchaser may be put in possession and the Pattah granted to him as requested

A. P. Shumbooloo

Reg & appeared 15/9/76.
& order Register
accordingly by
15/9

The

No 705.

29 The foregoing was communicated to the Collr Nandidroog Dr in the Chief Comms Proceedings No 6138/106 of 21st Sept 76.

30. With reference to the above, the Comms observes that the annual allowance payable by Shamiah the purchaser of the Garden in question is 6 Pagodas, and not 6 Pagodas & 3 Fanams as stated in the Proceedings above noted.

31. In inviting attention to the remarks in para 26 of this Memo, I beg to suggest that the Comms may be informed that from the Amildars report No 138 of the 11th June 1876 (which was returned to the Comms with the proceedings of the case) it appears that the annual payment by Shamia was raised to Rs 18-5-3 equal to 6 Pagodas and 3 Fanams.

Draft as amended
Pr 3/11

C. P. Thumboo
1. 11. 76

Drafted
4/11/76

Memo in Continuation of Nos. 347 and 705

32. The foregoing orders were communicated to the Commr. of the Nundidrug Division in this office Proceedings No 8164/150 dated 14th November 1876.

33. Colonel Pearse submits for the Chief Commrs. instructions the following additional circumstances that have since been brought to light regarding the garden belonging to the Appramayaswamy temple.

No 222 of 10-8-78.

34. When instructions were issued to carry out the Chief Commrs. order confirming the sale of the garden in question to Shamiah, one Potta Gowda of Chikkore Closepett Taluk, Complained

to the found that Shanmuka had no claims to the property as he had relinquished all his rights thereto by receiving back his mortgage money from Venkat Narsiah who in order to raise the necessary funds for this very purpose mortgaged the garden to him (Patta Book) on the 30th September 1874 for Rs 900; and further that there was no necessity for the sale of the garden as the value of the stolen property belonging to the temple had been realized from Venkat Narsiah. Under these circumstances the petitioner prayed that the garden which had

been in his possession
ever since it was mortgaged
to him by Venkat Narsiah
might be confirmed in
his favor on the same
terms as those stipulated
in favor of Shamiah
35. The Comm. referred
this complaint for a report
to the Dy Comm. and
from the reply it turned
out that the original
owner of the Garden, a
Europeanan Armakan —
endowed the Garden to
the temple and entrusted
it to the ancestors of
Venkat Narsiah for purposes
of improvement. Since
which period it appears
to have been in the —
possession of the family

who have annually paid
5 Pagodas to the temple
on its account
36. When the sale of the
garden to Shamiah was
cancelled in the first
instance he is said to
have mortgaged his share
in the property to petitioner
Pottaswda for Rs.900 and
that his brother Lukshmi
-pathiah likewise mortgaged
his share in it to Bora
Swda for Rs 600/- The
mortgagees above named
are reported to have agreed
to make the annual
payment of Rs 8-5-3 as
fixed by the Chief Commr
in his Order No $\frac{8164}{150}$ dated
14th November 1876. Shamiah
also, it will appear,
offers to pay the amount
bid Rs 132 he is

put in possession of the garden.

37. The Commr suggests that as Shanmuk has been paid the amount of his mortgage, the mortgagees Pootta Gowda and Bora Gowda should be confirmed in possession on their paying to the temple the purchase money Rs 132. and binding themselves further to the annual payment of Rs 18-5-3.

38 It is not clear whether Shanmuk admitting having received back the mortgage amount due to him. This may be clearly ascertained before passing orders on the present reference

Ex 23/8 22/8/78

39. The foregoing orders were communicated to the Comm[r] Kandidroog Dis[t] in this Office docket No 4148 of the 21st August last.

40. In reply, the Govt[t] of States X that the part of the mortgage amount deduce to Shamanah by Venkat= =nursiah alluded to has been acknowledged by the former on the 30th Octr 1874 on the back of the mortgage bond itself

41. The Comrs proposal (Vide para 37 above) may be approved.

C. P. Thumboo Chetty
14/9/78

I think a settlement should be made with Shamanah on the basis of

H.S.

9/9.

As called for in this Office docket No 4696/104

* No 267 dt 4.9.78

dated 18th September 78
the Commr of the Revenue
Dn forwards to this office
a statement, in which
Shamanah admits having
received back the mortgage
amount due to him by
Venkatrarsiah and states
that the receipt of the
amount was acknowledged
on the bond itself some
4 years ago.

24/12

In Cmnr for perusal vide
para 37 of his Memo
Regd Land Revn

28/12

Drafted

In 395 D 16/12/78

Memo in continuation of Duplicate Memo No 209.

The Amildar of the Closepet Taluk was accordingly instructed to confirm the mortgages (Motte Gowda & Boray Gowd) in the possession of the Garden on their agreeing to pay to the Temple the purchase money viz Rs 132 and binding themselves by Sunchitka to pay annually the Sum of Rs 18. 5. 3.

No 942 of 28-1-79. from the Dy Comm. to the Amildar.

The Amildar in submitting a deposition taken from the mortgagees, reports that they are prepared to continue to pay to the temple only the annual Rent of Rs 18-5-3 so long as they Remain in possession of the Garden in Question

No 65 of 4-10-79

As regards the purchase
money Rs. 1,132 it
would appear that Bore
Gowda and Motte Gowda
have expressed their
unwillingness to defray
the amount on the ground
that though the garden
was sold in order to
make good the loss
of the temple jewels yet
the loss was fully met
by the sale proceeds of
Venkat Narsiah's other
property.

With reference to Petition No 496
from Shamanna forwarded to
the Board for report, Mr. Ricketts
states that the Petitioner Shamanna
has no claim whatever to the
garden in as much as he
has already received back
the purchase money and that
the mortgage amount due to
him by the late Venkatnarsiah
for the garden has been paid.

The question of the Retainers rights being disposed of, Mr Ricketts Solicits orders whether the purchase money Viz 132 as should be recovered from the mortgagees in possession of the land — It appears from the Papers and Mr Ricketts report that the money due by the said Venkatnarasaiah, on account of the loss of Jewellery has been recovered from the Sale of his Mrs property — So that there is no further necessity for the recovery of the 132 Rs above referred to — V.J.

A Sifting enquiry was made by the Amildar as regards the point referred to in concluding para of the accompanying proceedings. The Amildar is strongly of opinion that the temple has no more claim than merely a lien for a fixed annual rent of Rs 18- 5-3, and therefore requests permission to call on the mortgagees to execute the necessary agreement as ordered in the said Proceedings.

One Tirumalabhatt of Irukoor has filed a counter petition in this office. claiming the whole garden for the temple, and referring to certain old accounts in support of its claim

These accounts shew that the temple has for a long time, been in the enjoyment of only 6 Pagodas and 3 fanams, out of the revenue from the garden. The proprietory right of the garden, it appears, rested with the family of late Venkata Narasiah, whose father as a donor had continued to the temple only 1/4 share in the garden -

Under these circumstances, the claim set forth by the petitioner in behalf of the temple is untenable, and cannot now be admitted to the prejudice of the mortgagees. I would therefore recommend that permission may be given to the Amildar to take a Muchalika from the mortgagees as directed

in the above proceedings, subject however to any further decision of Civil Courts to which all claimants in behalf of the temple coming forward against this order, will be referred, to establish its claims, if any.

17th May/83.

(Sd) Syed Nasiruddin
Muzrai Officer

Approved
(Sd) A.H.M
Collector.

True Copy"
Asst. 18/6/95

2517 -29
6-6-57

J. D. Gardon Esqure
Chief Commisioner
Moysare Government
Bangalore.

Sir;

I e undersigned most humbly
met the followeng few lenes
d consideration, hopeng tha
with succesp.

ht the gardrn named Anak
ramay aswamy in the Dublic
ot the popepeion of it by the Governm
er was issued by the Commisp
Division, that the sale of the
old, that the gardrn shoulo
vernment; and the produce of
treated for the bar-procepeion
he case, Phat Chakkara Mottay
have the popepeion of the gar
ormed that the sale of the g
& that a Muchaleika shou
unt should be recollected fro
ne manner I took the money
they, with the object of render
tay Gouda, the Sowkar; delaye
g your honors order.

tioned your honor, on this subj
was informed, that two of my
Division, in obedience to the Che

Commesioners proceedings of 21st September 76. (En

I therefore submitted a petition on the 24th May together with a stamp; for which, I ded not receive reply. Though I waited from that time for order, It was not done so up to this time, nor; I ceive any reply for my petitions.

As I purchased the said gardrn in the Public uction on the 14th February 72, I have more claims on any others

I therefore request yoner kind honor to good enough to settle as to the chief commissioners ceedings of 21st Sept 1876 & thus protect yours bedient servant, providing a favourable reply for y petitions

For this act of kindness, I shall ever pray to the Almighty God for your honors ing Life and Prosperity.

Your's obedient & humble servant

[redacted]

Residing in the Fort

Chennapatna

(General Serial No. 32.)

1881/82.

No. 2102.

Name of Petitioner. Jannah

V

Ramapatam

Cloverpet

Bangalore

1. 11. 81

3. 11. 81.

sal.

ures. one

ABSTRACT.

I decreed in this
the Judgement of the
the petitioner
Rules of the Board
garding the destruction
the Arkan garden
tached to the dwelling
appurtenances
and the Judgement
granted by that officer
is herewith submitted.
The petitioner is prepared
to pay up the amount
for which the garden
was sold and to
undertake the expenses

I therefore submitted a petition on the 24th May 79, together with a stamp; for which, I did not receive ny reply. Though I waited from that time for n order, It was not done so up to this time, nor; I ceive any reply for my petitions.

As I purchased the said gardin in the Public uction on the 14th February 72, I have more claims than any others

I therefore request your kind honor to good enough to settle as to the Chief Commissioners proceedings of 21st Sept 1876 & thus protect yours bedient servant, providing a favourable reply for ny petitions

For this act of kindness, I shall ever pray to the Almighty God for your honors ing Life and Prosperity.

Yours obedient & humble Servant

residing in the Fort

Chennapatna

12-7-1893



I therefore submitted a bill

(General Serial No 32.)

2517 8/82 No 1

1881/82

No. 2102

Name of Petitioner. Saiwanah

V.

Village. Chennapatana

Taluk. Closepet

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 1. 11. 81

Date of Receipt. 3. 11. 81.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. one

ABSTRACT.

As directed in the office endorsement No 2577 the petitioner applied to the D/Conr Regarding the restoration of the Arkan garden attached to the Kacheri Appraisal was made and the endorsement granted by that officer is herewith submitted. The petitioner is prepared to pay up the amount for which the garden was sold and to

[illegible] with the [illegible] Cooperatives
[illegible] the [illegible] Rec'd, & Com. — Or, the
Gov't may petition the [illegible] under its
[illegible] to Acquire Carry on the
"Operations"

(P.15)

The Petitioners' Prayer is the following
Vizt.

The petitioners Claims are not recognized
(vide Chief Comm'rs Sec: Ltr [illegible] dd 11-10-8[illegible]
[illegible] received Copy of the Municipality's Counter
Claims & the Petition.

[illegible]

ಕಲಾವಿದರಿಗೆ ಮಾಸಾಶನ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡುವ ಕುರಿತು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿ

264

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಂಘದ ಸಭೆ

ಸ್ಥಳ: ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೧೨.೦

Rec'd with letter dt. 4/11/80

1814.80 Ref

No. 2517.

Name of Petitioner. Samanda

Village. Thennapatam

Taluk. Closepet

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 29. 10. 79.

Date of Receipt. 31. 10. 79.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. nil

ABSTRACT.

Submits an English petition requesting to be placed in possession of the Sachian Thota Garden purchased by him at the public auction.

P.P.

Vide final orders in Bro: Rp. 4027 431 of 11th Oct 1880:-

Endorsement 1 Oct. referring him to the D/Govt. & state that final orders on the subject of his complaint have been given.

VS

Endorsed 31/10/81.

Entered -

No. 1589

Name of Petitioner. Channacca & Fort

Village. Channapatna -

Taluk. Closepett.

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 20th August 76

Date of Receipt. 24th — 90

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Four.

ABSTRACT.

Referring to his former petition and the orders thereon passed which were conveyed to him in this office Endorsement No. 654 of the 4th July 76. Petitioner submits the orders obtained from both the Division and D.C. Commrs. and begs that the garden which he purchased for Rs. 132 in the public auction may be made over to him, as the sale was subsequently cancelled and the garden unjustly given to Venkatarsiah on whose account it was once sold.

Patitioner also submits that when the Amildar desired him on the 18th Instt. to execute a Mootchallika

Dist Dis

heading himself & his family
to pay the expenses (viz Pagodas 6–30)
of certain ceremonies
observed in the temple,
petitioner stated that he
would pay the same, on
condition of the Govt making
over to him his garden
on receipt of Rs 132 which
was refunded to him.

P. P

DR.

Translation of the Dyforum's
Endorsement No 107 of 30th June 76–

As it appeared from
the correspondence that took
place on Dasabhoyee's com-
-plaint on this subject, that
the Garden should be attached
to the temple and the revenue
thereof should be utilized
for the performance of certain
ceremonies in the temple,
the Amildar has, in obedience
to the Mundiroof Division
Joumin's docket, been directed
to cancel the sale held
for the recovery of the amount
due by the Shanbhog of the
temple, which was considered
to be illegal, and that
no further orders can be
issued on the subject.

(Signed) A. Lindsay–

Translation of the Mundiroof

Division Commissioners
Endorsement No 175 Dated the
30th June 1873

You should represent the case to the Dy Commr, & obtaining his orders thereon, you may if necessary submit a petition to this office with the orders of the Dy Commr.

(Signed) L. Ricketts
Offg Commr
Nandidroog Dn

Translation of the Nandidroog Commr's Endorsement No 808 of 23rd January 1874.

Roads Roobkarries Nos 864 112 of 9th October & 28th Novr respecting from the Dy Commr of the Bangalore District, received on the complaint made by you, that a portion of the garden attached to the Appramiyaswamy's temple at Malloor had been mortgaged to you by one Venkatnarsiah — As your complaint could not be summarily disposed of, you may go to the proper Courts to recover the amount due to you. Returns the enclosure of your petition —

(Signed) N. Hill
Offg Commr Nandidroog Dn

No. 496

Name of Petitioner. Shemanna

Village. Hosur, Chennapatna

Taluk. Closepet

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 24/5/79

Date of Receipt. 26/5/79

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil.

Report as to what has been done to execute decree in O.S. No. 9 of 1870 dated.

ABSTRACT.

Submits an English Petition inviting attention to his, recent Petition regarding the garden known as Anakar in the village of Mynakan in Closepet Taluk, and begs for favourable orders.

Shekharanna Ayangeru

Former Petitions Nos 5779 and 2017 have been sent to the Hunr Court for disposal with office Memo No 1545 of 21st Augt 1877 From the Petitioners statement it appears that the C.C. order passed in No 8164 dated 14 N. No 150 Nov 1876. have not yet been given effect to.

Hubly Court may be requested to report the action on the C.C. Orders above. — HS

2/6

the garden, should be appropriated for the ex
honses of the Cur- procepeon of the said Appra -
nay as away. Upon this, the Government took
he popepeon of the said garden, which then contain
ed 6 months of produce, and leased it. The money
aid by me was returned after 21 months, by which
I sustained a great lop.

While this being the case Venkatanarasyah in
e mean time petitioned to the Commepioner of
Vendedoorg Devesion, stating that the Putta of the
arden was in his name, and that it ought to be
his popepeon. On which, It was Endorsed
at an order was given to the District Commepioner,
give the popepeon of the garden to the Hedawale and -
ttay dar, that Venkatanarasyah should be restrained
hold it, and that he should abide according
the muchaleka, which he had given previously.
So soonen, Venkata narasyah received this, he mar-
aged it to others On what authority he did so,
not known.

Before I had time to bring the above into
r honors notice, I was informed, that the
le of the garden was confirmed by your kind
or, and that a muchaleka from me (the -
rchasers should be taken, and that the said
sent should be collected from me. Agreably
I received an order from the Sale -

Though I took the money to the Taluq Auth
Treasury 4 or 5 times, they with the object of rendering
assistance to Mottay Gouda Mortgage, delayed
without executing your honor's kind order. I again
petitioned on this subject, for which, I received an
Endorsment No 2017, that two of my petetions were
sent to the Commessioner of Nundidoorg Division, in
= obedience to the Chief Commissioner's proceedings of
21st of September 1876. Though I waited from that
time, with the expectation of the order being enforced
it was not done so up to this time, now, I received an
reply to my petitions.

Now I hear that your honor had or
to collect the money from Mottay Gouda, Mort
and to make over the garden to him. If it
I humbly request your kind honor will be
good as to favour me with any kind of Ende
= ment, to my petitions.

As I purchased the said garden in
Public auction, on the 14th of February 1872, I h
more claims than any others. As it was not
settle according to the proceedings of the Ch
Commissioner of the 21st of September 1876, it
ground to various correspondances and delay.
it was mortigaged to any one, since the
on which it was sold by Public auction,
would be of little consequence.

After the sale was confirmed, the
overnment, should have taken the money
rom me (the purchaser) as well as Muchalika
to the claims of the Temple & the Government; &
e said garden might have given into my care.

If the order of the Commissioner of Nundidevy
vesom was confirmed. the garden might have
n leased and the money obtained from it might
ve given to the Car-procession of the said
Upramayaswamy after covering the expanses for
improvement. No one has right to mortgage it.
his being the case, your kind honor should consider
the claims of the garden go to Mottay Gouda, Mort-
age, depriving me (the purchaser)

It was already known that the said garden
nged to the Temple named Upramayaswamy.
it is plainly stated in the Endorsment No 1013
te Division Commissioner, that the Pattaydar
no right whatever to mortgage the said garden.
therefore request your kind honor to cause
rder given in my favour to be brought into
e and thus protect me (your humble servant).

For this act charitable kindness, I shall
ray to the Almighty for your honor's Long
and Prosperity.

I beg to remain
Your most obedient and
humble servant

Entered
15.3.77

No. 5775.

Name of Petitioner. Shamanna

Village. Chennapatam

Taluk. Closepett

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 12 March 77

Date of Receipt. 12. "

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 1.

ABSTRACT.

Referring to his petition
dated 20 August 76 begs to
state that 2 orders
nos 1052 & 1111 were sent to
him by the Amildar to the
effect that the sale of the
Mussalman garden (attached
to the Doddur Appramaya
swamy Temple) purchased
by him in Public Auction
had been sanctioned by the
Chief Commr & that he should
appear in person & produce
the amount of sale & to
execute a Mochaleka pro
=mising to pay annually
Rs.

After the sale was confirmed on
the 8-5-3 & the temple
proceeding to be presented
& passed before the Sitting Court
& presented an application to
the Commissioner. In reply an Endorse
ment no 312 dated 11-8-3 was given to
him that some objections
having been raised by one Narasappa
in order no 652 from the Dy Comm-
& in docket no 292 from the Dt Comm-
have been received calling for certain
particulars as the subject & that he
could not receive the amount from him
till further orders on the subject were received
by him - the Dep. to say that he sustained
heavy loss by cancelling the sale & by resuming
the garden that had been purchased by him
about 21 months ago -
the further adds that when the garden in question
was taken back from the enjoyment of the Dep. on
the reason that it was a temple property it ought
to have been allowed to the temple & resumed by Govt
but it was not a legal act in having given it to one Narasa
but it was no a legal act in having given it to one Narasa
who has mortgaged it to some one else -

Prays that on a perusal of his former petn
(quoted above) with other records, the sale of the garden
may be made in his name & he may be permitted to
it on mortgage & that the amt
taken. in

Enclosures

1877781

The Enclosures of Pet No 1589 of 1876-77 may be returned to Petr.

This Petn & No 5779 bind up below may be opened & Order for disposal with Reference to Cs. Pets Nos 6178 of 76-77 dated 26 & 106 Petn respectively accordingly

Approved [illegible] 7/8/77

Letters 8 877

Inspected 7/8/77 Ex. Inspected [illegible]

No. 2017

Name of Petitioner. Shanmuga

residing at Cumbah

Village. Chennapatam

Taluk. Closepett

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 22. July 77

Date of Receipt. 29. do

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures Nil

ABSTRACT.

Invites attention to his petition dated 12 March 77 requesting that necessary instructions may be issued to carry out the Chief Commrs order regarding the Arrack Sarden attached to the Malon Appramanjeswarans Temple states that he received no reply to the above nor its enclosures returned to him. He has been requesting the Amildar from December last to receive from him the amount of being the sale

proceeds of the said garden but
the Builder has been much coming
time in the season that no orders have
been rec'd from the District office -
besides the garden has not also been
given to this profession - It appears
that the amount which had been not
received from him was, after a long
delay of 21 months, returned to him at
much loss to him - He now finds hard
to preserve the money in these days of
scarcity -

Prays that on a full consideration
of his previous petn & its endorsers,
necessary orders may be sent to the Builder
at an early date & he may be favored with
an endorsement & also the endorsers &
of this former petition -

P. P.

L Ramiah

No. 1545
7: 250

Mysore Chief Commissioner's Office.
Duefter Department

Official Memorandum.

The accompanying Petitions No^s 2017 & 5779 dated 22^d July & 12th March 77 received at the Chief Commissioner's Office from Shamanna residing at Chamapatna Kasba, Closepet Taluk

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~ enclosures to the Comm^r of Mandydrop Division for disposal with reference to Chief Comm^r's Proceedings No. 6138/106 dated 21st September 1876

BANGALORE,
11th August 1877.

"By Order,"

Secretary.

1/
D4

358

1875.

From the Commissioner of
Assiny Arts, Division.

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
General Department

Dated 8th December 1875

Despatched

Received 11 Dec

Reg.

ENCLOSURES NO.

General No. 358 of 1875-76
No.

Secretary's Office
No. 32 dated 26th April 1872.

Submitted for consideration
& orders in regard
to the application
of the Assistant Secretary's
benefit at Darjeeling.

To Registry
11 12 75

Tiptur Taluk.

No. 5.

Posting an Assistant Surgeon to Tiptur.

Messrs. D. S. Mallappa and G. K. Gurappa, Tiptur taluk.

Existing order or practice relating to the subject—

Is by the Deputy Commis-

Summary of Representation.

An Assistant Surgeon may be posted to the Dispensary at Tiptur.

Very necessary.

No. [illegible]

Commissioner's Office
Bangalore [illegible]

To,

The Secretary to the Chief
Commissioner of Mysore.

Sir,

I do not long to your official Memo
No. 32 dated 26th Jan 1872, forwarding
for disposal a petition from Doraia
Boyee of Devarahilli in the late Chan
-napatna Taluk praying to notice
certain irregularities in connection
with a garden belonging to the
Sri Prasanna Venkatramanaji's Temple at Arolu.
I have the honor to report as follows:—

2. In the year 1864, when some
of the property of the temple was
stolen, it was decided that Venkat-
-ramiah, the Shanbogue, and the other
temple servants should make good
the full value thereof. The Shanbogue
paid to Government the amount,
and steps were taken to realize his
share from the sale of the property.
In carrying out this arrangement, the
garden referred to by the petitioner
was sold by auction, as it was sup-
posed to be the Shanbogue's property.

On

3. On receipt of the petition, more or less forcible, an enquiry was set on foot and it was ascertained that the site in question was originally selected by a Successor of the Star League with a benevolent view of the Village Salt Supply having the usual rare objects for cultivation and cultivation carried out - certain amount of success by the Devadasi, and was to be left available for that purpose. The Star League on the interest mortgage a portion of the garden to one Shanmugam, in the year 1867/68 when Rathayee Ammal executed an Hypothecation Deed for the said garden was originally made out in the name of the Star League.

4. After some correspondence, an order was sent from this Office directing the sale of the garden by the Collector and it was found not to be the Star League's property. In carrying out this order, the Rev. Commissioner kept the garden under Government management and applied the value of the proceeds towards the object which the donor originally had in

[illegible]

5. On Thursday Counsel for [illegible] proceeding against the former [illegible] adopted by the Provisional [illegible], Major Hill, then Deputy Commissioner of the Division held as follows:

"Order!"

"On the cancellation of the sale it "follows that the land should revert to "the former holder, now Defendant "for it, the Statute gives to declare "him his possession by the Deputy "Commissioner, namely, that he con- "-ceals the Estate on which he held "it, is not sufficient to satisfy his "being deprived of his Estate thereon, "and therefore should be restored "to him as the Dy. Commissioner "can call upon him to act up to his "engagement."

"No Summary order can be "passed on Summary petitions un- "-less proceeding strictly to the Consolida- "-ted Courts for the recovery of this "money."

6. It is reported that the Thandagu has not yet paid his share of the value of the stolen property, and he is un-

therefore

therefore still under suspension
from office.

7.— I take only to bring out that
under present arrangements persons
in prove custody are [illegible] on account
of benefices and other institutions are
not entitled even to sell or mortgage
the properties without leave of Bishop
and as my own results to Himself,
and I beg respectfully to state that
in my opinion an effectual step
should at once be had to such grave
abuses, and that some stringent rules
are necessary with reference to ex-
communicated Priests for the future.

8.— I will request the Major Mills
Order from me to admit that I
do not consent to the arrangement
ordered by him, as under the cir-
cumstances, that Dr Walsh should have
been made out in the name of the
Archbishop - with the Archbishop as
Custodian not in the name of the
Archbishop himself who now
of course considers himself as
the proprietor as recognised by
Government.

9.— As Major Mills was however
exercising Co-ordinate jurisdiction
when

When I receive the order, I must leave it to the Officer Commanding, to make arrangements for suffering as little inconvenience as possible.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

Commissioner.

56

General - 1876. 1143 / 98

From The Commissioner
Dun dudeng[illegible] Sea

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
General Department.

Dated 25th May 1876.
Despatched 30th May 1876.
Received 1st June -

ENCLOSURES NO

General No. } 1876—77
No.

Acknowledges receipt of No 3660 / 277 of the 12th Instant.

Requests that the boundaries of the Reserves connected with certain irregularities in the case of a garden belonging to the Appraiser Sibsunkur Dutt at Halisahar in the Bhuspatt Pergunnah

2. The Boundaries of the Reserves & the Temple also accompanying -

Deputy Commissioner.

Sent to Mr Ryland
31-5-76

9
94

General 1876. No. 8680
277

From

To The Commissioner of the Nandydroog Division

Dated 12th February
Despatched —
Received

ENCLOSURES NO.

General No. 8680
R.C. No. 277

Your letter No 338 dated 8th December 1875 reporting on the petition of Dorsa Boyee of Davanhalli in the late Chamrajnutra Taluk bringing to notice certain irregularities in connection with a garden belonging to the Apprameya Swamy's Temple at Hallur.

Requests submission of the Proceedings and Endowment accounts connected with the Apprameya Swamy's temple and the Endowment accounts.

By Order

Secretary

Read Appeal Petition
from Dassa Boyce of Dassa
-vahalle in the Lake Chemmee
-pattu a Talukk to the Chief
Commissioner praying
against the sale of a garden
the property of Visvanaya
Swami Temple on account
of the Shanbogi liability

No 4704 Dy. 1st August 1876. Order thereon.

Before passing final order
in this case the Chief Com-
-missioner desires the Com
-missioner may be good
enough to ascertain and
report whether Shamiah
the purchaser of the garden
in dispute is willing to pay
annually 5 Pagodas to the
Temple of Visvanaya Swami
and to execute a Muchulka
accordingly binding himself,
his heirs and assigns to con
-tinue the allowance

1/5/76

To The Commissioner of
Nandydroog Division

1876 112

In the Common Pleas
Division

Court of Common Pleas
Cuyahoga County, Ohio

No. 4704

Filed Aug 8 1876

Request certain information
and admissions
and petition for protection
against use of a Sandusky
subpoena to the Appearance
Docket Sample

From the clerk's office 8/16 No 224

106

1876. P. 3465. 223

From

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
General Department.

Dated

Despatched

Received

ENCLOSURES NO

General No. } 1876—77.
No.

No 6138
R 106 d/21st Sept/76.

c. Vandydroo Commissioners letter No. 224, dated 4th September 1876, reporting that Ramiah, the purchaser of the garden attached to the Temple of Appramaya Swamy at Malur in the Closepet Taluk, is willing to pay annually 6 Pagodas and 3 Fanams to the Institution, and to execute a Moochilka accordingly.

Order thereon:—

The Commissioner is requested to confirm the sale of the garden in question to Ramiah, after requiring him to pay the purchase money, and ~~Attached~~ Furnish a Moochilka on proper stamp binding himself, his Heirs, Executors, Administrators and Assigns to pay the Annual allowance to the

Temple

when Hotel Sindhia has been completed etc,
Temple. ~~After the above has~~
~~been carried out~~ ~~the~~
~~Commissioner's decision~~ ~~ceases~~
~~to be~~ Shamiah may be put
in possession of the garden
and a Pattah issued. Sim
~~as requested.~~

2 In connection with the
Proceedings of this case, the
Chief Commissioner remarks
that Major Hill, while
Offg 2nd Commissioner, acted in
violation of the standing
orders in upsetting by his
decision of 15th January 1874,
his predecessor's order of 2nd
December 1872.

Offg Secretary

To

The Commissioner of the
Sandoway Division

96

Nov. 1876. 108

From

To The Commissioners of H.
Kinderdroog Division

Dated 21st
Despatched 22 September
Received

ENCLOSURES NO.

General No. 6138
No. 104

Regarding to confirm
their sale of the garden
in question to Shamsiah
on certain conditions.

Rev 1876. 128

From

The Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore.

To

The Commr. &c.
Nundidroog Divn.

Dated 18th Octr

Despatched 27th do

Received 7 Nov

Rg 67 **ENCLOSURES NO.** 1 Packet sealed by Supdt sent separate

General No. 7069
& No. 126

Your Docket Rs. 1520 of the 7th Instant, requesting that the proceedings connected with the case of a certain Garden attached to the Apprameya Swamy temple at Molur in the Closepett Taluk may be returned.

Returns the proceedings as requested.

"Bgwarden"

Offg Secretary.

J/96

Received 1874. Encl. at date 5th 152

From The Commissioner, Northern Division

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner, General Department.

Dated 7th

Despatched

Received 9th October

Replied 10th "

ENCLOSURES NO

General No. 1 2 } 1874—77.
No. 15 12

Chief Commrs Pass No 1138 of R 106 of the 3rd Ultimo, confirming the sale of certain garden attached to the temple of Siddhapranne Iswaraswamy at Moluk in the Cuddapah District, to the purchaser Shamiah on certain conditions.

I have the honor to request that the proceedings connected with the above case may be returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient
humble Servant,
[illegible]
Commissioner.

To
The Secretary
to Government,
Public Department,
Fort St George.

No 2521.

[illegible] (13)

To Rajahmundry 26
23-10-76

Received.

187 . 166

From The Commissioner of
Circars, Rajahmundry.

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
General Department.

Dated 21st October 1876

Despatched

Received 23 " "

Read 28 " "

ENCLOSURES NO.

General No. 1115 } 1876—77.
No.

Proceedings of the Chief Commissioner of Mysore No. 6178, dated 21st October, directing orders regarding the grant of the garden attached to the temple of Sri Parvathy at Kolar in the Kolar Taluk.

With reference to the above, have the honor to observe that the annual allowance payable by Shamiah the purchaser of the garden in question is 6 Pagodas (vide this Office No. 224 of the 4th Instant) and not 6 Pagodas and 3 Fanams as stated in the Proceedings above referred to.

Commissioner

submitted with the
Success in con

6/11/76

No. 8164 / 8.150 d/14 Nov. / 76.

Docket No. 165 of the 21st October 1876 from the Commr. Nandidroog Dn., stating with reference to the Chief Commrs Proceedings No. 6138/106 of the 21st Septr/76 that the annual allowance payable by Shamiah, the purchaser of the garden of the Appramaya Swamy Temple at Srobur in the Closepet Taluk is 6 Pago-das and not 6 Pago-das and 3 fanams as stated in the Proceedings above referred to.

Order thereon — Directly, the Commr. is informed that from the Amildars report No. 138 of the 11th June 1876, which was returned to the Commr. with the Proceedings of the case, it appears that the annual payment by Shamia was raised to Rs. 18-5-3 Equal to 6 Pagodas and 3 fanams.

To the Commr., Nandidroog Dn.

Offg Secretary.

96

Revenue 187b. No 4 15

~~From~~

~~The Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore.~~

To The Commissioner Mundydroog Division

Dated 14
Despatched 15
Received

ENCLOSURES NO.

General No. 8164
R No. 150

Intimating that it appears from the Amildars report the annual payment by Shamiah was raised to Rs. 18-5-3, which is equal to 6 Pagodas and 3 Fanams.

1878. 8/2042.
110

From Government Secretary

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
General Department

Dated 11 August
Despatched 13
Received 13
Regd 15

ENCLOSURES NO.

General No. 322 } 1878–79
No.

Jres Ffrom No. 338 388 of
16 December 1875.

Submits a further report
on the case attached
to H. Appuhamy —
Swarna Jewelle of
Matale —

For Sanction.

13-8-78

187 . No 47.

From

To The Commissioner
of the Kumbakonam Division

Dated
Despatched 24th August 1878.
Received 26th do do

Enclosures No.

General No. 4148
No. 49

His letter No 222
dated 10th instant
bringing to notice certain
additional circumstances
in connection with the
garden belonging to Appoo
= vayyiswamy's temple
at Tholur in the Ghoseput
Taluk.

" "

Referring to the above,
Requests the Commr
to report whether
Shamanah to whom
the sale of the garden
was confirmed in this

Office Proceedings No 6138/106
dy 21st September 1876
Admits having received
back the mortgage
amount due to him by
Venkatnarsiah.

By order
V. S.
Secretary

187 . No 94

From

To The Commissioner
of the Nundydroog Dn.

Dated 18th
Despatched " September 1878.
Received 19th "
Enclosures No: —
General No. 16961
Rev No. 104

His docket No 267 dated
4th instant stating with
reference to the enquiry
contained in this office
docket No. 4148/49 dated 24th
ultimo that the payment
of the mortgage amount
due to Thaimanah by
Venkatnarsiah has been
acknowledged by the former
on the 30th September 1874
on the back of the mortgage
bond itself.

" —

Referring to the above,
Requests that ~~no statement~~

1878. 0.4264.
205

From Secretary Mercara
Nuwara Eliya &c

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
General Department.

Dated 16 December
Despatched 16-
Received 19 Dec

Enclosures No. 1

General No. 3962 | 1878—79.
No.

The Secretary's No 4696/164 of
25th September 1878

Has the honor to forward
a Statement taken from
Thavarea regarding the
Mortgage executed due to
Land by Vembotan arakkai.

Secretary
To Supt. Kurunegala
Superintendent Central
Province

No. 222

Vandalsburg Commissioner's Office
Rangapalem 10th August 1876

From

The Commissioner of the
Vandalsburg Division

To

The Secretary to the
Chief Commissioner of Mysore

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No 3997 of the 18th December 1875, and the subsequent correspondence marginally noted, I have the honour to submit for the instructions of the Chief Commissioner the following additional circumstances that have since been brought to light regarding the garden belonging to Appramayaswamy's temple at Mudur.

from Secretary No. 3620/277 dy 12th February 1876
To ——— Do ——— 779 dy 15th May 1876
from ——— Do ——— 4704/111 dy 7th August 1876
To ——— Do ——— 2340 dy 5th September 1876
from ——— Do ——— 6138/106 dy 21st ——— Do ———
To ——— Do ——— 1529 dy 7th October 1876
To ——— Do ——— 1650 dy 21st October 1876
from ——— Do ——— 1066/126 dy 18th October 1876
from ——— Do ——— 8156/150 dy 16th Nov. 1876

2. When instructions were issued to carrying out the Chief Commissioner's order confirming the sale of the garden in question to Shamiah, one Potta Gowda of Chikkere, Chief of Talak, complained to me that Shamiah had no claims to the

No 6138/1067 dy 6th Sept 1876

The property was first conveyed to him
[illegible] he [illegible] mortgaged
[illegible] Ponnia who in order to
save the necessary formalities for this very pur-
-pose mortgaged the garden to him (Poola
[illegible] the 30th September 1874 for Rs.900/
& adjusted that there was no necessity
for the sale of the garden as the value of
the stolen property belonging to the Temple
had been realized from Venkat Narsia. Under
these circumstances the petitioner prayed
that the garden which had been in his
possession ever since it was mortgaged
to him by Venkat Narsia might be con
-firmed in his favor on the same terms
as those stipulated in favor of Dhanraj.

3 I referred this complaint for re
-port to the Deputy Commissioner, and
from the reply received I learn that the
original owner of the garden, a Muhammadan
by name Anakan endowed the garden
to the Temple and entrusted it to the ances-
-tors of Venkat Narsia for purposes of
improvement. Once which proved to
have been in the possession of the
family who have annually paid a Rayadar

to

to the Temple on the account.

4. When the sale of the garden to Ohanniah was cancelled on the first ground he is said to have mortgaged his share in the property to petitioner Poota Gowda for Rs. 400 and that his brother Da ishimiya-tuth likewise mortgaged his share in it to Bora Gowda for Rs. 600.

4. The mortgagees above named are reported to have agreed to make the annual payment of Rs. 18-5-3, as prayed by the Chief Commissioner in his Order No. $\frac{8164}{150}$ dated 14th November 1876. Ohanmah also offers to pay the amount of his bid Rs. 132/4 he is put in possession of the garden.

5 I beg to suggest that as Ohanmah has been paid the amount of his mortgage the mortgagees Poota Gowda and Bora Gowda should be confirmed in possession on their paying to the Temple the purchase money Rs. 132, and binding themselves further to the annual payment of Rs. 18-5-3.

No 8099 of 7th January 1879
158

Proc: of the C. Com: of Mysore

Read again letter from Com: of the Mandiroog Division, No: 222 of 10th August ult: submitting further report on the Canon attached to the Appramayaswamy Temple at Mallur in the Closepett Taluk, and suggesting that as Shamanah has been paid the Amount of his mortgage the mortgagees Poota Gowda and Bora Gowda should be confirmed in possession of the garden on their paying to the Temple the purchase money Rs: 132, and binding themselves

further

Letter to the annual
payment of Rs: 18-5-3.
2. Docket to the Comr. of
Kandiroya Dr. No. 4148/49
of 24 Augt 78.
3. Docket from Dr.
No: 2674 Septr 78.
4. Docket to Dr. No.
4696/164 of 18 Septr 78.
5. Docket from Dr
No. 3950 of 16 Decr 78.

Order thereon.

The Commissioners
proposal submitted
in his letter No. 2220
10 Augt 78, read above
is sanctioned.

Secy:

To
The Comr. Kand

1879 No 155

[illegible]

[illegible] 7th January.

Read 5th July 79.

No 8099

R 158

Sanctioning the proposal submitted by the Commissioner regarding the land attached to the Appasamyasawmy Temple at Madura in the Closepet Taluk.

No. 2702
P. 350

Mysore Chief Commissioner's Office.

Official Memorandum.

The accompanying Petition No. 496, dated 24th May 76 received at the Chief Commissioner's Office from Shamanah, Fort Chennapatna - Closepett Taluk.

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~ to the Dy Commr of the Bangalore Dt for report as to what has been done in the case with reference to this office Proceedings No 6138/106 dy 21st September 76.

BANGALORE,
3d Sept. 1876.

"By Order,"
Sd/-
for Rev: Secretary.

---

as below -
2. From the Amildars
21/10/76

D Js

The Dy Commr.
Bangalore Dt.

Dy 3/9/79
N°. 2702
O. 350

Forwards Petn 496 of 24/5/74
from Shimoga for
report.

1879.

From Sir Raymond Westbrook Knt.

To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
Revenue ~~General~~ Department.

Dated 20th
Despatched } October
Received 21

ENCLOSURES NO 1 to with Ver: proc

~~General~~ No. 301 } 1879–80
No.

Sir,

With reference to the Chief Commissioner's Official Memorandum No. 2702/350 dated 3rd September last, forwarding for report, a petition from one Chanmarla of Ugamapatna regarding the garden belonging to the Malour Ishpranya Swamy temple in the Closepet Taluk, I have the honor to report as below.

2. From the Circular

[illegible] No 35, I have the honour to be submitted, with its enclosures, [illegible] in reply to your letter No. 8999/158 of the 14th ult. regarding the Garden [illegible] to be allowed to the Chief Commissioner's Peon, alluded to in the above Memorandum, I am directed to state that the Chief Commissioner's Peon, Appa Row, was allowed to retain the above Garden, after receiving from them the amount of sale, viz, Rs 132-

3. The Collector now states that the said individuals object to pay the purchase money, saying that though the Garden in question was sold in order to make good the loss of the temple jewels, yet the loss was made up from other property of Venkatarama, but that they are willing to continue to pay to the temple, only the annual rent of Rs 18-5-3, so long as the Garden remains in their possession-

4. It may be added that the Petitioner has no claim whatever to the Garden, inasmuch as he has already received back the purchase money, and as the mortgage amount due to him by the late Venkatarama on the Garden in question has been paid to him, I request to be informed on the subject.

5. The Enclosure of the Memorandum under Reference is herewith returned-

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedt Servant
[illegible]

No. 4027 of 11 Oct 1880.
P 431

Read:

Docket No 301 dated 20 Oct 1879
from the Deputy Commissioner,
Bau. Sub-District, reporting
upon the petition from one
Shamanna of Chemupatna,
regarding the garden belonging
to the Maisur Agrahara
Swami temple in the
Closepet taluk: —

order thereon:

From the above letter which
has remained unanswered
though an overnight, it
appears that the petitioner
Shamanna who was paid
back his purchase and
mortgage money has no
claims whatever in the matter.
2 — There are however
other points in the case
which require the noted.
3 — The Lake reports state
that the money due to the
temple

Tenth Warrant in Court
Security, Hawkers &c. Act
1871, Alleging from previous
Reports the Garden appears
Should been brought under
Act on the Share of the
Court, Inquiry &c. by the
Shamrajpur Venkatramanah
Remanded undivided &
the Sixth of Jan 267-15-11.

Therefore against the
Statement that the Garden
was given to the Temple
by a Mussulman Arakan
and that the Shambogue—
Venkatramaiah family
held it as Pure Managers
or Trustees paying an
annual Rent to the
Temple, in which case
they could have no right
of property in the Garden
to forfeit either their
Lease or mortgage it,
and there could be no
reason why the Rent
should

should the minister [illegible]
[illegible].

4. ~~If no~~ Should the Ly Commissioner be satisfied that the garden is the property of Ebenezer Hannah's family, the Temple Company is merely a lien for a fixed annual payment, & that the value of the ground lease has been fully repaid, it will only remain for him to see that the parties now placed in possession of the garden execute to the Government on behalf of the Temple and duly register the agreement required binding the holders of the garden and their successors for ever to pay to the Temple the annual amount due to the Temple from A.

To The Dy Commr
Bangalore D.C.
with Proceedings

Asst. Secy

9

1880

To
The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt

Encl. 1 file Vernacular papers.

No 4027
of 1431

Passing orders upon the Petition from one Shamanna of Chikka-patam regarding the garden belonging to the Malvoor Prasanna Swami Temple in the Closepett Taluk.

(General Serial No 30). 295

189—

From The Dy Commissioner Bangalore Distt.

To The Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore Mungoi Depart.

Dated 22d August/92

Despatched 23rd —Do—

Received

Enclosures No. 1

General No.

D No. 189.

This Office docket Nos addressed to the Chief Secretary, as noted in the margin, soliciting orders, as to the recovery of the Gutta amount from the lessee of a Garden belonging to the Madina Temple Closepet Lalbook.

In Continuation of the above, has the honor to forward herein

In 996 dated 22-1-86
1051 do — 8-2-86
16 do 7-4-88
465 do 25-10-88.
475 do 20-10-88

To Revenue 8689 25/8/93

herewith, Chennapatna
by: Anibar Mary
No. 32 dated 13th Instant
bringing to notice that
the garden in question
which is under a
mortgage, is about
to be sold to the
same Mortgagee,
and the sale deed
may likely be produced
for registration.
-2:- early orders
are therefore soli-
cited in the matter.

Yours faithfully
Dy Commissioner

Jr.

H ZARAI.

(General Zarai . 30)

1893.

From

The Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

To

The Dy Com^r.
Bangalore Dt.

Dated Camp Mysore 30th May

Despatched 1st June

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 868
Muzarai. F. No.

His D. No 189 dy 22nd Aug 92
Submitting for orders
the Chennapatna Dy
Amildar's Urgi No.
32 dy 13th idem re-
garding the Anakanna
Jaden in the Village
of Mylnayakanahalli
Chennapatna Taluk-

~~Also the Report~~
In returning the
enclosure to the above

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore.—12-1-93.—1,000.

Rom^d Zarai No 5 dy 3/7/93

I am the honor to observe
that the papers con-
nected with the Ana-
Kanana Sanden alluded
to in the Dy Comm'l Agt's
Report have not been received
as the Office
2. The previous dockets
of the Dy Comm'l Agt
in the one under
reply all refer to
Tayanti Sanden.
also situated in the
same Village, about
which orders will
be issued at an
early date

By order

A
Secy

neral Ser 1 No. 30.)

8

1893 94

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore Dist

To The ~~Dy~~ Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Mugrai Department

Dated 3rd July 1893.

Despatched 4th Do

Received 4th

Enclosures No. 1 file 7.P.

General No.

19 No. 5.

His docket-No. 868 dated 1st Ultimo, regarding the papers of the Anekana Garden in the village of Mainaikana halli, Channapatna Talut

In returning the enclosure to the above, have the honor to forward herewith, Channapatna Amildar's report-No. 12 dated 9th Ultimo

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—27-1-93.—5,000.

with its enclos[illegible]

for orders

[illegible]

For Dy Commissioner

WHS

[Gen. Serial No. 31.]

1894-95.

From The Dy Commissioner.
Bangalore District.

To
The Secretary to the Govt.
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.
Muzrai Department.

Dated 17th May 1895.
Despatched 17th Do
Received 18th Do

Enclosures—No. two.

General No.
D No. 1399.

Has the honor to forward for information report No 50 from the Amildar of Chennapatna from which it would appear that the land by name "Arkum Garde originally belonged to th Appramiswami Temp at Malur in the Chenn -patna Taluk, but the Patta thereof was fraud -lently got made in th

name of Venkatanarsa the then Cultivator and Shanbogue of the said Temple in the year 1862-63, when all the gardens were assessed and Batayi System abolished.

A. Narasimangar
For Dy Commissioner.
Wsg

15.0

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸಮಯಾವಕಾಶ ನೀಡಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ಸಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ
ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣವನ್ನು ಏಕಪಕ್ಷೀಯವಾಗಿ
ಆಲಿಸಿ ಆದೇಶ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು
ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಹಾಜರಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಅಂಚೆ
ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಆದೇಶಿಸಿದೆ.

ಆದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಅಂಚೆ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಹಾಜರಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.
ಆದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಅಂಚೆ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

38

944/12

17-7-46 Bloomfield

ಸನ್ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೆ 21 31-8-94

ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು ಅದರ
ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ. ದಿನಾಂಕ 29.8.94.

ಇಂತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 4091
7960

ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ವಿಷಯ

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸ

ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ

ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಹೆಸರು

ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿ

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರ ಸಹಿ

ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಹಿ

9-9-94

1897-98

From

The [illegible] of the

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore Muzrai Department.

Dated 8th } March 1898.
Despatched 9th }
Received
General No
No 1183
Enclosure

This office No. 189 of the 22nd August 1892.

Soliciting early orders on the subject of the necessary of the Sutta amount from the lessee of a garden belonging to the Mahua temple in the Channapatna Taluk.

refer as to [illegible]

[illegible] 64 [illegible] MUZRAI DEPT

L. No 1183

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 8th March 1898.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

Sir,

I have the honor to invite your attention to this office No. 189 dated the 22nd August 1892, soliciting orders about the recovery of the Gutta amount from the lessee of a garden belonging to the Melur temple in the Channapatna Taluk, and to request the favor of early orders on the subject.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

mrs

శ్రీ నిండ్రు నిండ్ర నదము
ప్రతిష్ఠించిన సుందరీ తీరం
తరతరములు శాశ్వతంగా
కాపాడవలసిన శాసనం 1900

భవ్య శ్రీ పట్టణాధీశులు శ్రీ మల్లుండ
అత్రి మల్లయ స్థాపించిన శ్రీ పట్టణం
నగళ్ళ ద్రమండిదళిగళు రంగోయిం
గాండు. నిన్నభద్రం నవరుసహశరశి
ద శ్రీ శ్రీ లకు ——

మల్లుండరు అత్రి మల్లయస్థా
పించిన నిన్న శ్రీ. శ్రీ నాయితనహ
శిగ్రా లుదల్లా లనతాన శ్రీ ండ్ల తవం
శవందు శ్రీ ండ్ల తవిధీ యిదరబిల
శవతిగు వుండు 10 యితశ్రీ. తశిం

ర 40 ఫి. ల్ల శీరుంతిం లు-లుబలనీ
లుబదన్న దీలవన్నిసన్నపై బిరినశత్తి
విళ్ళ లను భిభిన్న సదన్ల లుబశాత్ర లు
దు డాబగీశవన్నీ లుబుశేంలనము
గీ శిళ్ళ లను లలల్లి

యుం శేంలంబదశవ్వీ ళ్ళిరు

వివల్ల-శిబినులు భూంగనాంశిలులద్ధి
శంశేంబనరన్నీంబ్బల్లనాంశివనులు.శాం
నీ శిబినులు భూంగనాంగద్ధిలింబశన్నఫిన
రిగీవంబి శేంబంధనలు-లుబవనులని
త్తీశరులుం లను లుబవనలుగశీద్ధీ
బ్బల్లనఫిన రిగీలుబులు.నదరి
శీద్ధీ బ్బల్ల లుబుంభిగీ త్తీశరవవ్వీ
నాంగి-లుబవనలుగనఫినరిగీవవ్వీ
లుంగలు శేశరాంరు భులత్తి గీశీలరిగీ

శ్రీరంగపట్టణములభభోగాండాలుమా

నవ్వినట్లయితే

చన్నపట్టణాంధ్రులు ఉపవాసి

శ్రీరాములు బిల్లకొండనాగులు

ధరి భక్తిశ్రద్ధలతొండనాగులధర

బంగారపు నదరిబిల్లపెన్నిబిల్ల

స్నేహంగలుధ్రి. అందరిపేరంపనర

స్నేహవల్లవస్నేహరులుంద్రిబిల్ల

ంగలుధ్రి. బువరుగళ్లు. శ్రీ

శివప్పలు ఇంగ్లీషు. గ్రబంధాలు

ప్రకాంర చేలవసద్దినస్నేహం రు

స్నేగలవద్దుదా బిల్లకొం

డనిరాశవసు. వరుశేలవరుశిర

ద్రీబిల్లప్రేవది వని. 80బంధాలు

ధినశ్రీ కేంబల్లు బ్రాంధ్రణానంత

వర్గలోపం రిసుస్నాసు. యిందం

1890. [illegible]

From The [illegible]

To The Secretary to
Government [illegible]

Dated
Despatched
Received
General No.
[illegible] No. 1



Enclosure No. 1

To D.O. No. 996 of 22nd January 1890
and To D.O. No. 118 of 28th [illegible]

Refer
24/2/90

Encloses a report from the
Asst Commissioner, Colombo,
on the matter of the unauthor-
-ized alienation of the
Aukana Garden belonging
to the Appurumeya Swami
Temple at Aukana, and requests
early orders of the Government
thereon.

The question has been
disposed of so far back
as 17th May 1883 by the
by the then Govt Agent
pursuance of Govt Agent
Govt's order 4027 dd 11th
October 1880 - and it
cannot be re-opened

16/8/90

Vide no 216 dd 18.8.90

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 19th [illegible]

No.

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Inam Department
Bangalore.

Sir,

In forwarding herewith a report No 1248 dated 17th May 1900, from the Assistant Commissioner, Closepett, asking for early orders in the matter of the unauthorized alienation of the Ankan Garden belonging to the Appremeya Swami temple at Malur by the Shanbhogue of the temple, I have the honour to state that the marginally noted references were made to Government in

No 996 dated 22nd January 1896 to the Chief Secretary
" 1051 dated 8th February 1897 to the Chief Secretary
" 16 dated 4th April 1898 to the Chief Secretary
" 465 dated 5th October 1898 to the Chief Secretary
" 475 dated 30th " 1898 to the Chief Secretary

No 159 dated 22nd August 1899 to the Inam Secretary
No 1183 dated 9th March 1898 to the Inam Secretary

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

MUZRAI

189

From

To

The Dy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

Dated 8th August 1900

Despatched

Received

General No. 216

Muzrai F. No. 172-92

Enclosure No. 1 file

Correspondence ending with his Letter No. 107 dated 19th July 1900 regarding the Archaka garden of the Sri Abhrameya Swami temple at Arakere, Channapatna Taluk.

Has the honor to state that as the question raised in the papers cited above has been already disposed of so far back as 17th May 1883 by the then Dy Comr in pursuance

of the late Chief Commissioner's order No. 4027 / P. 431
dated 11th October 1880
and that the same cannot
therefore be now reopened.
2. The Enclosures are returned.

By order.

Assistant Secretary